

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2 identifying Fig. 2 as prior art, pursuant to the Examiner's request.

Attachments: One (1) Replacement Sheet of Drawings including Figures 1 and 2

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 3, 2006, the Examiner objected to the drawings; object to claims 1-3 and 5-7 as containing informalities; and rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by Admitted Prior Art of Fig. 2.

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the drawings to identify Fig. 2 as "Prior Art", pursuant to the Examiner's request. Applicants have also amended the claims to cancel features not illustrated in a drawings. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is moot and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 1-3 and 4-8 to correct informalities and more appropriately define Applicants' invention. Accordingly, the objection to claims 1-3 and 5-7 is moot and should be withdrawn. Applicants have also added new claims 9 and 10. No new matter has been added by this reply.

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1-8 as being anticipated by Admitted Prior Art for at least the reason that Admitted Prior Art fails to disclose every claim element. For example, independent claims 1 and 5, from which claims 2-4 and 6-8 ultimately depend, each recite a combination of elements including simultaneously applying a voltage to the respective inspection electrodes via the pairs of probe pins by drivers connected to the respective pairs of probe pins. In contrast, the inspection method of Admitted Prior Art uses relay mechanisms to *alternately* apply a fritting voltage to the inspection electrodes, as illustrated in Fig. 2 of Admitted Prior Art. Thus, Admitted Prior Art fails to disclose, at least, simultaneously applying a voltage to the respective inspection electrodes via the pairs of probe pins.

In addition, independent claims 1 and 5 each recite, among other things, applying an inspection signal from the drivers to the electrodes of the to-be-inspected object. In contrast, the inspection method of Admitted Prior Art employs a power supply device for providing a fritting voltage to the inspection electrodes and a test device that is separate from the power supply device, thus requiring the use of relay devices to facilitate providing fritting voltage and inspection signals from the separate inspection and power supply devices to the probe pins. Accordingly, because the power supply device and test devices of Admitted Prior Art are, in fact, separate, Admitted Prior Art fails to disclose applying both a fritting voltage and an inspection signal using a single driver, as required by Applicants' independent claims 1 and 5.

Because Admitted Prior Art of Fig. 2, fails to disclose every claim element of independent claims 1 and 5, or claims 2-4 and 6-8 that depend therefrom, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of these claims is improper and should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, none of the cited references disclose or suggest every claim element of new claims 9 or 10. For example, Admitted Prior Art does not disclose or suggest at least the electrical connector including, among other things, sequentially applying a voltage to the respective inspection electrodes via the pairs of probe pins by drivers connected to the respective pairs of probe pins and applying an inspection signal by the respective drivers to the electrodes of the to-be-inspected object via the respective pairs of probe pins, wherein each driver transmits the inspection signal and the voltage via electrical connection lines connecting the driver to the respective probe pins included in the pairs of probe pins, as included in new claim 9.

Furthermore, dependent claim 10 is also in condition for allowance at least by virtue of its dependence from independent claim 9.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains other characterizations and assertions regarding the claims and the cited art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 3, 2006

By: 

Brad C. Rametta
Reg. No. 54,387

Attachments: One (1) replacement drawing sheet